



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,654	01/27/2004	Younger Ahluwalia	03398.000005.	3974
5514 7590 08/04/2011 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 1290 Avenue of the Americas NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800				
EXAMINER				
PIZZALI, ANDREW T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1798				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2011		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1                                   RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
2                                   UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3                                   \_\_\_\_\_  
4                                   BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5                                   AND INTERFERENCES

6                                   \_\_\_\_\_  
7                                   *Ex Parte* YOUNGER AHLUWALIA, MATTI KIIK,  
8                                   and THOMAS D. KAROL

9                                   \_\_\_\_\_  
10                                  Appeal 2010-004933  
11                                  Application 10/766,654  
12                                  Technology Center 1700

13                                 \_\_\_\_\_  
14                                 Oral Hearing Held: January 12, 2011

15                                 \_\_\_\_\_  
16                                 Before CHARLES F. WARREN, JEFFREY T. SMITH, and KAREN M.  
17                                 HASTINGS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

17                                 APPEARANCES:

18                                 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

19                                 JOHN D. MURNANE, ESQUIRE  
20                                 Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper & Scinto  
21                                 1290 Avenue of the Americas  
22                                 New York, New York 10104-3800

23                                 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,  
24                                 January 12, 2011, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany  
25                                 Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Timothy J. Atkinson, Jr., a Notary  
26                                 Public.

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE WARREN: Is this gentleman a guest of yours?

MR. MURNANE: No, Your Honor.

UNNAMED MAN: I have the next hearing. I was just observing.

JUDGE WARREN: That's fine, if you have no objection.

MR. MURNANE: I don't, Your Honor.

JUDGE WARREN: We are commencing a hearing on Appeal  
Number 2010-004933.

MR. MURNANE: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE WARREN: You may begin when ready, sir.

MR. MURNANE: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court,  
I'd like to begin discussing the claims here, the first two claims, the  
independent claims. First, a heat-insulating and fire-resistant composite  
material consisting essentially of a first layer, which comprises a surfactant  
component, surfactant generated microcells, a filler component and a binder  
component and a second layer comprising a metallic component adhered to  
the first layer. There is no substrate that's noted in claim 1.

JUDGE WARREN: But claim 1 can include a substrate?

MR. MURNANE: We disagree, Your Honor. We note that this is the  
big point here and we --

JUDGE WARREN: Well, one of the things I wanted to ask you,  
counselor, was if you look at the specification, paragraphs 21, 23 and 26, it  
would appear to indicate that the basic and novel characteristics of your  
invention are not compromised by the presence of a substrate.

MR. MURNANE: I wouldn't say they are compromised, but I think  
we have different inventions, Your Honor. If I may invite attention to the

1 specification, page 15, paragraph 45, the last sentence says the substrate  
2 provides strength for the composite material. And I would also invite  
3 attention to page 23, paragraph 66, where it says when a substrate is  
4 employed the first layer may be adhered on one side or both sides of the  
5 substrate, depending on the intended application. For instance, if one side of  
6 the substrate is coated with at least -- to at least some extent with the first  
7 layer, and the second layer comprised the metallic component, then the other  
8 surface may be covered to at least some extent with another material. In the  
9 roofing materials industry, for example, the other material may be  
10 conventional roofing asphalt, modified asphalts, and nonasphaltic coatings  
11 and the article can then be topped with roofing granules. If we take --

12 JUDGE WARREN: But the term consisting essentially of itself is not  
13 defined in your spec.

14 MR. MURNANE: We believe, Your Honor, when we look at the  
15 specification as a whole, the entirety of the specification, and we see the  
16 many different products that can be made with the claimed invention, we see  
17 that there are varieties of products. It talks about fabrics, it talks about  
18 building materials, and here I gave an example of roofing materials. It is  
19 noted that the substrate provides strength for the composite material. I think  
20 this specification describes the elegant efforts of the inventors to provide  
21 flexibility for those of skill in the art who wish to read this disclosure and  
22 then make different kinds of materials. Perhaps they're going to be making  
23 fabrics. Perhaps they're going to be making mattress ticking. Sometimes,  
24 strength may be more important in some instances than in another. And so,  
25 it's our view, Your Honor, that we really do have two inventions here, and  
26 with the wide variety of environments in which the invention can be used, it

1 may be sometimes you want that strength and other times perhaps flexibility  
2 and pliability would be more important.

3 Now, Your Honor, the Examiner has noted in the Answer, in the  
4 paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4, that the Ahluwalia teaching, the prior art  
5 Ahluwalia teaching, the '257 teaching, taught the use of a binder, including  
6 an acrylic latex, such as hi carb 2679. And the Examiner notes, it should be  
7 noted that hi carb 2679 polymer emulsion contains synthetic soap,  
8 sometimes known as surface active agents or surfactants, thus meeting  
9 Applicants' limitation of a surfactant component. Furthermore, because a  
10 surfactant is present in Ahluwalia's composition, surfactant generated  
11 microcells would also be present. With that construction, Your Honor,  
12 assuming that's the construction to be given to these claims, if we take that  
13 construction and say that's the construction of the claims, then claim 2 of  
14 this application is, essentially, the same claimed subject matter of claim 1 of  
15 the application we spoke about earlier this morning, Your Honor. And so  
16 we would submit -- and these cases were filed on the same day -- when the  
17 patents issue, should they issue and, hopefully, they will, they will have the  
18 same term. This claim 2 is really the same claimed subject matter as the first  
19 claim of the case we talked about earlier today, and so we would submit all  
20 the arguments presented there should obtain for this as well, Your Honor.  
21 The same prior art is cited against it.

22 JUDGE WARREN: Did you have the same showing in your case  
23 here?

24 MR. MURNANE: We don't have in the specification the same  
25 showing. Again, if the Office takes the position that the claimed subject  
26

1 matter of claim 2 is identical to the claimed subject matter of claim 1 of the  
2 prior case, we would submit that the same unexpected results should apply.

3 JUDGE WARREN: You still have to have basis in the record of all  
4 that. What defends your position, counselor?

5 MR. MURNANE: Thank you, Your Honor, and with respect to claim  
6 1, we do believe claim 1 is distinguishable for the reasons noted in our prior  
7 colloquy, Your Honor. It is different. We believe that --

8 JUDGE WARREN: We're not saying that it has to have a substrate,  
9 we're just saying you have several different embodiments there, one of  
10 which can have a substrate.

11 MR. MURNANE: Thank you, Your Honor. And as we noted on  
12 page 2 of our Reply Brief, you know, we believe, that there are -- by the  
13 way, there's a typo there and I apologize, Your Honor. That refers to page  
14 5, paragraph 15 of our spec. It should been have been page 15, paragraph  
15 45. I apologize for the error, Your Honor. And again, the same points that  
16 we made with respect to the other case with respect to Komatsu and the  
17 criteria that the Federal Circuit established there and the distinctions with  
18 respect to Langer, the British '060, Dugan and Dombeck. We would say  
19 they all apply, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE WARREN: Okay.

21 MR. MURNANE: I have nothing further on this, Your Honor. I  
22 would entertain any questions.

23 JUDGE WARREN: Thank you very much, counselor.

24 MR. MURNANE: Thank you very much, Your Honors.

25 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)

26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26